



PATENT  
3449-0132P

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Jin-Tae ROH Conf. No.: 3954  
Application No.: 09/664,360 Group: 2653  
Filed: September 18, 2000 Examiner: Aristotelis M. PSITOS  
For: OPTIMAL RECORDING METHOD FOR OPTICAL RECORDING  
MEDIA AND OPTICAL RECORDING MEDIUM STORED WITH  
INFORMATION ABOUT OPTIMUM RECORDING CONDITIONS

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

September 8, 2005

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Restriction Requirement dated August 4, 2005, with a one-month extension of time being petitioned to October 4, 2005, the following election and remarks are respectfully submitted in connection with the above-identified application.

**RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

The Examiner has made a requirement for restriction between the following groups of claims:

Group I: Claims 4-12, drawn to an environmental history  
managing/monitoring capability for an optical recording system; and

Group II: Claims 22 and 24-35<sup>1</sup>, drawn to obtaining/developing an optimum recording power capability for an optical recording system.

The Examiner also required an election among the following species for each Group:

- a) species drawn to recording appropriate information in a lead-in area or an area inner than the lead in area of an optical recording medium; and
- b) species drawn to recording the appropriate information in respective lead-in areas of sessions of an optical recording medium.

#### **ELECTION**

In order to comply with the Examiner's Restriction Requirement, Applicant provisionally elects, without traverse, to prosecute Group II, species (a), directed to claims 22, 25-28 and 30-35, for prosecution in the present application. Applicant reserves the right to file a Divisional application directed to the non-elected claims at a later date, if so desired.

#### **REMARKS**

Favorable action on the present application is earnestly solicited.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Examiner's indication that claims 22 and 28-35 (instead of 22 and 24-35) belong to Invention Group II is treated as a typographical error since claims 24-27 depend from claim 22.